

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 and 18-32 are pending. Claims 1, 10, 11, 13-15, 20, 22, 23 and 25 are currently amended. Claim 17 is canceled. Claims 28-32 are new. No new matter has been introduced.

The Examiner is thanked for allowing claims 1-9, 16, 18 and 19, and for indicating claims 10-15 and 20-27 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome rejections under 35 USC Section 112, second paragraph.

The Examiner conferred with the undersigned counsel in late October and early November, 2009, along with Supervising Examiner Daniel J. Ryman, during which the subject matter of the disclosure was discussed in the context of the language of independent claims 10, 20 and 22. While an agreement on specific claim language for certain claims was not reached during the discussion, the Examiner and the Supervisor are thanked for the discussion and for their efforts to expedite prosecution of this case. The suggestions and comments of the Examiner and the Supervisor were extremely helpful in preparing this amendment, and the amendment is believed to obviate the Examiner's concerns with claims 10-15 and 20-27.

Claims 1, 14 and 25 have been amended to address informalities. No change in claim scope is intended. Thus, claims 1-9, 16, 18 and 19 are allowable based on the Examiner's allowance of those claims. The allowability of claims 14 and 25 is addressed below.

The Examiner rejected claims 10-15 and 20-27 under 35 USC Section 112, second paragraph as indefinite. In particular, the Examiner contends the claims are incomplete and omit elements or steps the Examiner contends are essential. The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed, as well as any contention that any elements are essential or the absence of any specific element from any specific claim leads to the claim being indefinite. If a claim has a discernable meaning, it is not indefinite. See MPEP Section 2173, et seq.

However, as noted above the comments of the Examiner and the Supervisor during the conferences were extremely helpful and to expedite prosecution independent claims 10, 20 and 22 are amended. The dependent claims are amended as necessary to conform to the amendments to the claims from which they depend. Based on the discussion in the telephone

conferences referred to above, it is believed that the amendments obviate the Examiner's concerns, and thus claims 10-15 and 20-27 are allowable.

Independent claim 10, as amended, recites, "[a] packet switch comprising: a plurality of port controllers each with a cell input port and a cell output port, the cell output ports configured to output cells at respective start of cell times; ...an offset controller configured to shift the start of cell times for the respective output port in response to the detection of corrupt received cells by the error detector ... wherein said cross-connection switch comprises: a configuration controller configured to control an oscillation of the cross-connection switch between a loopback configuration in which cells received by the cross-connection switch are transferred back to a respective sending port controller, and a no-transmission configuration of said cross-connection switch." Claims 11, 13 and 15 were amended to conform to the amendments to claim 10. Claim 14 was amended to address an informality. Claims 11-15 and new claim 32 depend from claim 10. No new matter has been introduced. See the Specification at page 9, lines 1-7. Accordingly, independent claim 10 and claims 11-15 and 32 are allowable.

Independent claim 20, as amended, recites, "[a] method, comprising: synchronising start of cell times in a plurality of port controllers ... the respective cell output ports of the respective port controllers configured to transmit cells at respective start of cell times ...shifting a start of cell time for the respective port controller based on said start of cell signal using an offset controller, ... wherein said cross-connection circuit controls an oscillation between a loopback configuration in which data received from a respective sending port controller by the cross connection is transmitted back to the respective sending port controller, and a no-transmission configuration of said cross-connection circuit, ... and the shifting of the start of cell times for the respective port controllers is based on the detecting of corrupt cells transferred back to the respective port controllers." Claim 21 depends from claim 20. Accordingly, claims 20 and 21 are allowable.

Independent claim 22, as amended, recites, "[a] system, comprising: a plurality of port controllers each having ... a cell output port configured to transmit cells at start of cell times; and a cross-connection matrix ... having a configuration controller configured to control an oscillation of the cross-connection matrix between a loopback configuration, in which data

received by the cross-connection matrix is transferred back to a respective cell input port of the respective sending port controller, and a no transmission configuration ... an offset controller configured to shift a start of cell time for the sending port controller based on the detection of corrupt cells transferred back to the sending port controller by the cross-connection matrix during the loopback configuration.” Claim 23 was amended to conform to the amendments to claim 22. Claim 25 was amended to address an informality. Claims 23-27 and new claim 28 depend from claim 22. No new matter has been introduced. See the Specification at page 9, lines 1-7. Accordingly, independent claim 22 and claims 23-28 are allowable.

New independent claim 29 recites, “[a] method, comprising: oscillating ... a cross-connection switch coupled to a plurality of port controllers between a loop back configuration, in which data received by the cross-connection switch from a respective port controller in the plurality of port controllers is transferred back to the respective port controller, and a no-transmission configuration ... and ... sending a cell from the respective port controller in the plurality of port controllers to the cross-connection switch at a transmission time based on a clock signal and a delay for the respective port controller; checking data transferred back to the respective port controller by the cross-connection switch for receipt of a corrupt cell; when receipt of a corrupt cell is detected, increasing the delay for the respective port controller.” Claims 30 and 31 depend from claim 29. Claim 29 is believed to be allowable based on the discussion in the telephone conference with the Examiner and the Supervisor regarding allowable subject matter disclosed in the specification. Claims 30 and 31 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependencies. If the Examiner disagrees, a further telephone conference is respectfully requested.

Application No. 10/510,299

Reply to Office Action dated November 10, 2009

All of the claims remaining in the application are now clearly allowable.  
Favorable consideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

SEED Intellectual Property Law Group PLLC

/Timothy L. Boller/  
Timothy L. Boller  
Registration No. 47,435

TLB:jrb

701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 5400  
Seattle, Washington 98104  
Phone: (206) 622-4900  
Fax: (206) 682-6031

1505075\_2.DOC